

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100%; height: 100%;"></div>		Date of mailing (day/month/year)
Applicant's or agent's file reference 548767B		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
International application No. PCT/JP2005/002166	International filing date (day/month/year) 14.02.2005	Priority date (day/month/year) 17.02.2004
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC		
Applicant MITSUBISHI DENKI KABUSHIKI KAISHA		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the opinion
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/002166

Box No. I

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language
_____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/002166

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	2, 4-12, 14-16, 18-20	YES
	Claims	1, 3, 13, 17	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	7-12, 14-16, 18-20	YES
	Claims	1-6, 13, 17	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-20	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations:

- Document 1: JP 2000-165654 A (Toshiba Corp.), 16 June 2000, paragraphs 0051, and 0104 to 0107
- Document 2: JP 2000-4350 A (Hitachi, Ltd.), 7 January 2000, paragraphs 0036 to 0040; Fig. 9
- Document 3: JP 11-341452 A (International Business Machines Corp.), 10 December 1999, paragraphs 0004 to 0054; Figs. 6 to 8
- Document 4: JP 2003-169273 A (Sony Corp.), 13 June 2003, paragraphs 0062 to 0072; Figs. 4 to 8
- Document 5: JP 2000-332612 A (Canon Inc.), 30 November 2000, paragraph 0054
- Document 6: JP 2000-50057 A (Canon Inc.), 18 February 2000, paragraph 0059
- Document 7: JP 2003-143559 A (Sony Corp.), 16 May 2003, paragraph 0117
- Document 8: JP 2001-346157 A (Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd.), 14 December 2001, paragraph 0068
- Document 9: JP 2002-118820 A (Sony Corp.), 19 April 2002, paragraphs 0033 to 0042

The inventions of claims 1, 3, 13, and 17 are described in documents 1 and 2 cited in the ISR, and therefore do not appear to be novel or to involve an inventive step.

The invention of claim 2 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1 and 2 and documents 3 and 4 cited in the ISR. Varying the marking polarity in the time direction and/or space direction, as described in documents 3 and 4, in the electronic watermarking method described in documents 1 and 2 would be easy for a party skilled in the art.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/002166

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: Box V

The invention of claim 4 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1 and 2 and document 5 cited in the ISR. Embedding electronic watermarks in parts where the pixel value changes are large in the time direction, as described in document 5, in the electronic watermarking method described in documents 1 and 2 would be easy for a party skilled in the art.

The invention of claim 5 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1 and 2 and documents 6 and 7 cited in the ISR. Embedding watermarks in the edge parts of images, as described in documents 6 and 7, in the electronic watermarking method described in documents 1 and 2 would be easy for a party skilled in the art.

The invention of claim 6 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1 and 2 and documents 8 and 9 cited in the ISR. Embedding watermarks that are synchronized with scene changes, as described in documents 8 and 9, in the electronic watermarking method described in documents 1 and 2 would be easy for a party skilled in the art.

The inventions of claims 7-12, 14-16, and 18-20 are not described in any of the documents cited in the ISR nor obvious to a party skilled in the art.